

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12, 13 and 22-27 were previously pending in the application. Claims 4 and 9 are canceled and new claim 29 is added. Claims 5, 11, 14-21 and 28 were previously withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected species. Therefore claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-29 are presented for consideration.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As disclosed on page 3, lines 24-25, the blades 4 and 5 are at their utmost ends connected to the joint rings 6 and 7. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the joint rings rotate together with the blades and are adjusted similarly to the adjustment of the blades with respect to rotor rims 2 and 3. For example, a joint similar to swinging arm 10 in Figure 4a or the blades themselves may be an elastic material. See also for example GOUIN 3,288,396 Figure 1 or ROSTA et al. 3,606,209 element 15 in Figure 1.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12, 13, 22, 25 and 27 are rejected as anticipated by MEEK (Canadian Patent 2,195,581).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested because the reference does not disclose or suggest that the rotor comprises a circular rotor rim to which the roots of the blades are connected as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

By way of example, Figure 1a and 4a show a circular rotor rim 3 to which roots of the blades 5 are connected.

In contrast, MEEK teaches a plurality of blades 3, 3' connected to a shaft as shown in Figures 1 and 2.

MPEP §2111.02 states that "when not defined by applicant in the specification, the words of a claim must be given their plain meaning. In other words, they must be read as they would be interpreted by those of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Sneed*, 710 F.2d 1544, 218 USPQ 385 (Fed. Cir. 1983)."

Accordingly, the words in the claim must be interpreted by those of ordinary skill in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would readily distinguish between the circular rotating rim 2,3 of the present invention and a shaft as disclosed by MEEK. Specifically as disclosed on page 4, lines 7-10 of the present application, in conjunction with Figure 1c, the blades 4,5 connected to a circular rotating rim 2,3 suck air from the front part of a body 1 producing the negative pressure, and blow the air to the rear of the body 1 stopping the flow from detaching and the resistance from increasing.

In a helicopter, specifically a helicopter as disclosed by MEEK, blades attached to a shaft do not suck air from the front of the body to produce negative pressure and do not blow air to the rear of the body. Accordingly, the shaft of MEEK does

not read on a rotating circular rotor rim as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

As the reference does not disclose that which is recited, the anticipation rejection is not viable. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Claim 6 also recites a rotating circular rotor rim to which roots of the blades are connected. The comments above regarding claim 1 are equally applicable to claim 6.

Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 22, 25 and 27 depend from claims 1 or 6 and further define the invention and are also believed patentable over the cited prior art.

Claims 23 and 26 are rejected as unpatentable over MEEK in view of LANGFORD,III 5,106,035 and MARSI 6,158,960. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

LANGFORD,III is only cited for the teaching of electric motors to rotate rotors powered by fuel cells. MARSI is only cited for the teaching of using electric motors to change the blade angles. Neither LANGFORD,III nor MARSI teach or suggest a rotating circular rotor rim to which roots of the blades are connected as recited in claim 6. As set forth above, MEEK does not disclose what is recited in claim 6. Since claims 23 and 26 depend from claim 6 and further define the invention, the

combination of references does not render obvious claims 23 and 26.

Claim 24 is rejected as unpatentable over MEEK in view of LANGFORD,III and ITURRALDE 5,683,060. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

ITURRALDE is only cited for the teaching of surfaces made up of solar cells. ITURRALDE does not teach or suggest what is recited in claim 6. As set forth above, MEEK in view of LANGFORD,III do not teach or suggest what is recited in claim 6. Since claim 24 depends from claim 6 and further defines the invention, the combination of the references would not render obvious claim 24.

New claim 29 recites that in level flight, the body of the aircraft produces an ascending force. This feature is disclosed on page 4, lines 3-10, for example and is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Since claims 1 and 6 are believed in condition for allowance and since claims 1 and 6 are believed generic, reconsideration and allowance of claims 5, 11, 14-21 and 28 are respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is earnestly solicited.
Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance
be issued in this case.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in
the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested
to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this,
concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any
overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional
fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



Liam McDowell, Reg. No. 44,231
Attorney for Applicant
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297

LM/bsg